

MSR Stakeholder Working Group

Los Alamitos/Seal Beach/Rossmoor/Sunset Beach Focus Area

January 22, 2004

Meeting Minutes

(approved on February 17, 2004)

I. Call to Order:

The meeting began shortly after 6:00 pm with a welcome statement from Susan Wilson, LAFCO Vice-Chair. All stakeholders were in attendance.

II. Agenda/Desired Outcomes:

The facilitator explained the order of the meeting and the desired outcomes. The group acknowledged the expectations of the meeting and the facilitator moved forward with the agenda.

III. Introductions/Expectations:

Each Working Group member was asked to introduce him/herself and briefly describe what their expectation for success would be at the end of the meeting series. A summary of expressed expectations include:

- Vision for the community
- Collective ideas
- Roadmap for future service provision and governance
- Better understanding of future role of County in providing services to unincorporated areas
- Accurate and reliable data
- Understanding perceptions and misperceptions about the focus area and the issues
- "Win-win" situation that will benefit all affected agencies and communities
- How to provide the most efficient services in the most cost-effective way
- Alternative governance options for the focus area as a whole
- Identify opportunities to provide better services
- Identify opportunities to receive better services
- Potential impact to infrastructure within the area
- Dialogue regarding goals and what we have in common
- Consensus on recommendations for future
- Think outside the box – focus on the future, look for opportunities
- Build collaborations
- Identify full service needs
- Infrastructure for service provision 20 years out
- Protect and enhance quality of life, ensure community has a voice
- Create working relationships
- Get everyone invested in staying the course and finding solutions
- Clear communication with public regarding MSR process
- To be able to provide data and support to the working group

➡ Open-ended process to see where it takes us

IV. Working Group Process:

The facilitator engaged the group in a series of discussion topics regarding the working group process and ground rules. Each topic culminated in consensus agreement by the group. The topics included:

Discussion Guidelines:

- Commit to participate (commit to make the meetings and process succeed and represent your constituency)
- Comment during meeting, not after
- Share time – allow all members a chance to comment
- Maintain integrity of decisions & intent (each member's responsibility to ensure clarity/understanding)
- Quote substance of discussion and not the individual speaking
- Avoid interrupting
- Avoid side conversations
- Feedback to facilitator
- Respect (for ideas & individuals)

Decision Point – Discussion Guidelines – ***Adopted by consensus as stated***

Role of Working Group:

- Achieve purpose as set out
- Expectation that all members will attend all working group meetings
- If working group member cannot attend meeting, representative may be sent to monitor meeting, but will not be an active participant in the meeting

Decision Point – ***Adopted by consensus as stated***

Role of LAFCO:

- Dual Role
 - Full working group participant
 - Serve as support staff to working group
 - Minutes
 - Update workbook materials
 - Assemble and distribute data and other info to group
 - Draft vision plan at the end of the process for group's editing, approval
 - Present nine determinations to the Commission

Role of Technical Advisory Committees (TACs):

- Technical issues identified by the group will be tackled by committees of technical experts
- Technical advisory committees will meet separate from the working group committee and present findings to the working group
- Working group assigns issues for technical study
- Working group defines the composition of the technical committee – working group members could also participate on TACs

- Two companies, The Keith Companies (TKC) and Economic and Planning Systems (EPS) are currently on contract with LAFCO to provide consulting services to the MSR working group.

Role of Facilitator:

- Timekeeper
- Achieve desired outcomes
- Ensure outcomes are fair and representative of the group

Decision making:

- Consensus approach to decisions
- Everyone must agree by stating an active “yes” or standing aside or the decision will not move forward
- One “no” will stop a decision from moving forward
- Include all members in decisions
- Must agree to a decision or > say no or > stand aside – no abstentions
- If stand aside, reason must be stated

Decision Point – ***Adopted by consensus as stated***

Role of the Press:

The working group discussed how to deal with inquiries from the press and determined the following:

- Working group members will not speak with the press or have interviews with the press relative to the MSR and Working Group matters
- No working group member will make comments to the press or the public on behalf of the entire working group
- All press inquiries will be directed to LAFCO
- LAFCO will make all, if any, comments to the press
- Talking with the press should not be confused with reporting back to each member’s representative community/agency. Working Group members may present reports to their respective agencies and community constituencies.
- Press is welcome to attend meetings, as well as visit LAFCO website to access MSR information.

The commitment not to discuss the meeting with the press is based on the desire to create an environment of trust within the working group and to insure accuracy and consistency of information given to the press/public. If asked to present reports to community or agency, working group members agreed to limit the content of their reports to the substance of the discussions and not any individual’s comments per the agreed-upon discussion guidelines. There was group consensus on the role of the press as outlined above.

Decision Point – ***Adopted by consensus as stated***

Role of the Public:

- The public is welcome to attend all meetings
- Public comment period will be limited to a total of 15 minutes taken at the beginning of each meeting; three minutes per person

➡ Any person wishing to speak before the group will be asked to fill out a speaker card
Decision Point – *Adopted by consensus as stated*

Other:

Working group members wanted clarification from LAFCO that the MSR process will not encroach upon local control or force any working group member to do anything. LAFCO responded that the Commission will not force anyone to do something they don't want to do as a result of participating in the Working Group and MSR process

V. Purpose:

The group reviewed and approved the draft purpose statement prepared for the meeting. The *draft* statement read as follows:

The purpose of the Municipal Service Review (MSR) Stakeholder Working Group is to develop a 20-year vision plan which addresses future governance and municipal service delivery issues in the MSR focus area. The vision plan will be based on sound demographic, technical, and fiscal data, and designed to maintain or enhance the quality of life within the MSR focus area.

Decision Point – *Adopted by consensus as stated*

VI. Work Plan:

The group was given an opportunity to review and discuss the completeness of the work plan and whether or not it seemed viable and plausible given the proposed 10-meeting schedule. Desired outcomes, topics and tasks and assignments were reviewed for each of the ten meetings.

There was some response that it may be premature to adopt a workplan at this point. Some group members expressed concern and hesitancy for approving a workplan that they have not had a chance to review in advance. A suggestion was made to at least approve the tasks and topics for Meeting #2.

There was some discussion regarding the gathering of data and the role of the technical committees. It was clarified that technical advisory committees may be created and used for specific data compilation and analysis by request from the working group. The working group would recognize the need for technical advisory committees as the group progresses through the work plan. LAFCO staff once again stated that KIG and EPS, two consulting firms, have been contracted by LAFCO to provide support to the technical committees and issues. Working group member requested a background profile on the consultants. LAFCO staff responded that the consultants' profiles are included in the workbook.

The working group was asked to begin thinking of individuals they may recommend to serve on the technical committees.

The group agreed to adopt the work plan in concept and review and edit, if necessary, at each meeting.

Decision Point –**Adopted by consensus** as stated *(The group agreed to adopt the work plan, review at each meeting with the option to edit as necessary. The group may revisit the work plan at the top of each agenda)*

VII. Meeting Logistics:

The working group scheduled the remaining nine successive meetings through meeting #10 of the current work plan. The group selected various dates with the standing time slot from 6:00 pm to 9:00 pm. All meetings will take place at the Los Alamitos City Council Chambers.

LAFCO agreed to distribute the following documents:

- Agenda for Meeting #2 in advance
- Revised MSR Working Group roster
- Calendar highlighting dates for remaining working group meetings
- MSR Questionnaire via email
- Additional background on consultants

VIII. Next Steps:

Working group members were referred to the “assignments” section of the work plan for homework for the next meeting. Members were asked to provide LAFCO with maps of agency service delivery areas and agency or community profiles prior to meeting #2. LAFCO would then compile the information for distribution back to working group members.

IX. Adjournment

The meeting concluded and was adjourned at 9:00 pm.